

TAPE 8
Sice A, 5 1/3 - 5 1/2

15 October 1979

NOTE FOR: Charlie

FROM: D C I

Let's make the social engagements calendar "social and trips" so that everything my wife is involved in shows up on it unless the trips are really classified.

cy: CB
GM

NUNN TIES PACT VOTE TO ARMS BUDGET RISE

Key Senator Wants a Firm Pledge
on Spending From President

By CHARLES MOHR
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, July 25 — Senator Sam Nunn, an influential figure among Southern Democrats, threatened today to vote against the arms treaty with the Soviet Union unless President Carter made a firm commitment to increase military spending substantially.

In parliamentary terms, the Georgia Senator's announcement was perhaps the most dramatic development since three committees of the Senate began formal consideration of the treaty two and one-half weeks ago.

"All Sam is asking," said a Senate staff member, "is that Carter alienate the liberal wing of the Democratic Party with an election year coming up."

Senator Gary Hart, Democrat of Colorado, expressed the hope that the debate over the ratification of the arms treaty would not turn into a hearing on a defense budget authorization. But, increasingly, that seems to be what has been happening, several Senate sources remarked.

During a hearing by the Armed Serv-

ices Committee, Senator Nunn read a statement saying that without a commitment to begin and "to sustain" a greater military effort, "I could not, in good conscience, support ratification of the SALT II treaty."

the rate of inflation, that could mean an increase of \$7 billion to \$9 billion in the

The statement called for an increase in military spending of 4 to 5 percent in real terms, with inflation discounted, for at least the next five years. Depending on first year alone, a member of Senator Nunn's staff said.

In a brief interview, Senator Nunn later said that he was "absolutely firm" in his decision. He said the proposed annual rate of increase was not "a firm line," but he added that he could not seriously consider any increase that was much smaller. He also said he thought any pledge on increased spending should be made by the President on television.

In his statement, Senator Nunn expressed the hope that the Senate would be able to examine the military budget for the fiscal year 1981 before the vote on the arms treaty. But later he said he would prefer a preview of the 1981 budget rather than have the Senate delay its vote on the treaty until after the budget is formally submitted in January.

Senator Nunn also made clear that he wanted increases not merely in strategic nuclear weapons but in overall military spending. His own area of expertise is in conventional weapons.

His announcement, while not unexpected, was more specific than some in the Senate had expected.

However, it was seen on Capitol Hill as complicating the treaty debate as well as President Carter's political problems.

A member of the Senate's Democratic leadership said, "There is no question that Nunn is influential and some commitment may have to be made." The Senate leader thought, however, that Senator Nunn seemed to be asking a lot.

At least four Senators have complained about President Carter's decision to develop the MX mobile missile and have indicated that they may vote against the arms treaty in protest. They are George McGovern of South Dakota, William Proxmire of Wisconsin and Adlai E. Stevenson of Illinois, Democrats, and Mark O. Hatfield, an Oregon Republican.

They and other liberals may be upset if the President tried to satisfy Senator Nunn's demands, which call for spending far beyond the \$12 billion over five years contemplated by the Government.

Senator Hart's statement said the treaty ratification process should not be a substitute for the Constitutional process by which decisions are made on weapon requirements. And Senator John C. Culver, Democrat of Iowa, said it "puzzles me" how, at a time of tax-reduction movements, anyone could wish to increase an already large deficit with more military spending.

Unlike some critics of the treaty, Senator Nunn did not find fault with its provisions or with the Government's arguments for it. He said he embraced the view of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, some of whom testified again today, that the treaty was a "modest but useful" step if accompanied by more spending.

Senator Nunn said that inflation had reduced the rate of increase in military spending to less than 1 percent and that the Government had "succumbed" to a tranquilizing effect that the Joint Chiefs had warned might result from ratification of the treaty.

Saying that it was "abundantly clear" that the Carter Administration is not yet prepared to compete effectively with the Soviet Union in the military arena, Mr. Nunn added that without such effort "the SALT II treaty will become nothing more than an instrument for registering emerging Soviet military superiority."